

1  
2  
3  
4 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
5 **DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

6  
7 MARCO GUERRA,  
8 Plaintiff(s),  
9 v.  
10 HOTSPUR RESORTS NEVADA, LTD.,  
11 Defendant(s).

Case No. 2:24-cv-00747-RFB-NJK  
**Order**  
[Docket No. 16]

12 Pending before the Court is a stipulation to extend case management deadlines by 90 days.

13 Docket No. 16.

14 A request to extend unexpired deadlines in the scheduling order must be premised on a  
15 showing of good cause. Fed. R. Civ. P. 16(b)(4); Local Rule 26-3. The good cause analysis turns  
16 on whether the subject deadlines cannot reasonably be met despite the exercise of diligence.  
17 *Johnson v. Mammoth Recreations, Inc.*, 975 F.2d 604, 609 (9th Cir. 1992). “That a request is  
18 made jointly neither mandates allowance of the extension sought nor exempts parties from making  
19 the necessary showings to justify that relief. Failure to provide such showings may result in denial  
20 of a stipulated request to extend the case management deadlines.” *Williams v. James River Grp.*  
21 *Inc.*, 627 F. Supp. 3d 1172, 1178 (D. Nev. 2022).

22 The instant stipulation indicates that a lengthy three-month extension is warranted because  
23 Defendant has vacated Plaintiff’s upcoming deposition set for October 22, 2024, and Plaintiff will  
24 be traveling for work for six or so weeks. Docket No. 16 at 2. The stipulation fails to adequately  
25 explain why a lengthy three-month extension should be provided.<sup>1</sup> At its most basic level, the  
26

27 

---

<sup>1</sup> The stipulation provides no explanation of any kind why relief is warranted from the  
28 initial expert disclosure deadline, which is currently set to expire before the subject deposition at  
any rate.

1 stipulation fails to explain why the deposition as currently scheduled is being vacated. The Court  
2 has also been given no explanation as to why Plaintiff's work travel should trump his obligation  
3 to appear for deposition or why Plaintiff's deposition cannot be conducted remotely while he is  
4 traveling. Hence, a sufficient showing has not been made for any extension, let alone an extension  
5 of 50% of an entire presumptively reasonable discovery period. *See* Local Rule 26-1(b)(1).

6 Accordingly, the stipulation is DENIED without prejudice.

7 IT IS SO ORDERED.

8 Dated: October 17, 2024

9  
10 Nancy J. Koppe  
11 United States Magistrate Judge

12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28